



LIPSITZ & MCALLISTER, LLC

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ATTORNEYS

BRADFORD GREEN, BUILDING 8
755 MAIN STREET
MONROE, CONNECTICUT 06468

APR 3 2007
JEW

BARRY R. LIPSITZ
DOUGLAS M. MCALLISTER

TELEPHONE: (203) 459-0200
FACSIMILE: (203) 459-0201

In re Application of: **T. Kleinwaechter**
Application No.: **10/615,311**
Filed: **July 7, 2003**
For: **SURGICAL SAW BLADE**

Mail Stop AF
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Art Unit: **3731**
Examiner: **A. Lang**

Sir:

Transmitted herewith is:

- A Response in the above-identified application (3 pages);
- Return receipt postage prepaid postcard;
- I certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first-class mail in an envelope addressed to: **Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450** on **March 13, 2007**.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in the payment of the required fee(s) or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0625.

Very truly yours,

Douglas M. McAllister
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 37,886
Lipsitz & McAllister, LLC
755 Main Street
Monroe, Connecticut 06468
(203) 459-0200

Attorney Docket No.: **HOE-764**



PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:)
T. Kleinwaechter)
Serial No.: 10/615,311) Examiner: A. Lang
Filed: July 7, 2003) Art Unit: 3731
)
)

For: **SURGICAL SAW BLADE**

MAIL STOP AF
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first-class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on: March 13, 2007.

Signature: Carol Prentice
Carol Prentice

RESPONSE

Dear Sir:

This Response is responsive to the final Office Action mailed on January 9, 2007.

As a preliminary matter, Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the courteous and productive telephone interview held on March 13, 2007, the details of which are provided below.

Claims 1-20, 22, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arnegger (US 4,513,742) in view of Sonefors (US 5,361,665).

Claims 23-25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arnegger in view of Sonefors, in further view of Gerber (US 4,653,373).

Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections in view of the following comments.

Summary of Telephone Interview and Discussion of Prior Art

Applicant's undersigned counsel conducted a telephone interview with the Examiner on March 13, 2006. During the telephone interview, Applicant's counsel pointed out differences